

No.	Company	Date Received	Question	Draft Response	Status	Final Response	Date Posted
8	IHS Group	1/15/2004	<p>1. Is this solicitation being competed under FAR parts 13, 14, and 15?</p> <p>2. Within the solicitation, A/E firms are directed to respond to the SF255&254. Is a company which is not a registered A/E firm, but as “demonstrated competence and qualifications” meeting the requirements of the solicitation eligible to respond?</p> <p>3. If the current solicitation is limited to A/E firms, how would you recommend that we expand the eligibility to include non-A/E firms?</p>	<p>1. This procurement is being competed under FAR Part 36 procedures.</p> <p>2. No, any firm that provides A&E services must be an individual, partnership, corporation, association or other legal entity permitted by law to practice the professions of architecture and engineering. An A&E firm must also complete the qualification questionnaire (SF 254 and SF 255).</p> <p>3. See the answer to #2 above.</p>	Approved by legal and technical.	Same as Draft Response.	

9.	Indus Corporation	1/27/2004	<p>1. Must the prime offeror be an A&E company, or just use the A&E 254/255 process?</p> <p>2. Must the prime offeror have submitted a response to the RFO originally due on November 6, 2003 (amended date: December 8, 2003)</p> <p>3. Why did the opportunity change from Classification T-Photographic, mapping, printing, and publication services with NAICS code 541370 (Surveying and Mapping-Geospatial Mapping Services) to Classification C—Architect and engineering services when the SOW seems to indicate Information Technology over Architectural and Engineering?</p> <p>4. Why did the government decide to change the type of contract award from a performance based fixed price and award fee contract to Firm-fixed price?</p>	<p>1. Yes the prime offeror must be an A&E firm as defined in FAR Part 36.</p> <p>2. No, vendors did not have to respond to the Sources Sought notice issued originally on November 6, 2003 and amended on December 8, 2003.</p> <p>3. The reason why this procurement is A&E is because the SOW didn't change from the previous procurement that had been competed as A&E.</p> <p>4. According to FAR part 37.102-1 Architect-Engineering type contracts are exempt from using performance-based contracting methods.</p>	Approved by legal and technical.	Same as Draft Response.	
----	-------------------	-----------	---	--	----------------------------------	-------------------------	--

10.	Michael Baker Jr. Inc.	1/27/2004	<p>1. Is the cover letter exempt from the page count?</p> <p>2. Must graphics in the proposal use 12 point type for any text they contain?</p>	<p>1. Yes.</p> <p>2. In the FedBizOpps announcement, it says that the SF255 with attachments must be limited to 25 pages not smaller than 12-point font.</p>	Approved by legal and technical.	Same as Draft Response.	
11.	Cadcam Org.	1/21/2004	<p>1. Do we understand for this phase you are really just asking for a capabilities proposal and of course forms 254&255?</p>	<p>1. Yes, however, please thoroughly read the RFP and make sure you include the items listed in Block 7 and 10 of the SF255 and ALL other necessary information listed.</p>	Approved by legal and technical.	Same as Draft Response.	
12.	Indus Corporation	2/4/2004	<p>1. Due to the recent traces of Ricin found in the mailroom on Capital Hill, is DOT not accepting packages from Federal Express or UPS?</p>	<p>1. Yes, DOT is accepting all packages from Federal Express, Airborne Express, and UPS. Please do not send any proposals via regular mail.</p>	Approved by legal and technical.	Same as Draft Response.	